

REMARKS

In light of the above amendments and remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10, 14, 16, 18-21, and 23-26 and amended claims 1, 5, 9, 11-13, 15, 17, 22, and 27-33 are in this application.

In paragraph 5 of the office action, the Examiner objected to the drawings because “they include... reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description.” The specification has been amended herein to include the missing “reference signs”, and as such, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

In paragraphs 6-8 of the office action, the Examiner objected to the abstract, disclosure, and title of the invention. The abstract, disclosure, and title have been amended herein and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

In paragraph 9 of the office action, claims 5 and 11 were objected to because of some informalities. Claims 5 and 11 have been corrected herein and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 11 of the office action, claims 12 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the inventions. Claims 12 and 15, as amended herein, are believed to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112 and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 15 of the office action, claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13-15, and 17-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Isoda (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,835).

Independent claim 1, as amended herein, recites in part as follows:

“...a judging means for detecting print data specifying information included in a print data transmitting command supplied from the printing control unit, and judging... the **image type** of the print data transmitted from the printing control unit...” (Underlining and bold added for emphasis.)

In explaining the above 102 rejection, the Examiner appears to have relied on col. 4, lines 13-15, 28-32 and col. 18, lines 52-56 to teach the feature of judging the type of the print data. It is respectfully submitted that such portions of Isoda as applied by the Examiner (hereinafter merely “Isoda”) do not disclose “judging... the image type of the print data” as in claim 1. That is, Isoda discloses determining “a rasterization level.” (See col. 18, lines 54-55.) The rasterization level is determined using parameters such as printer name and line type such as USB, IEEE 1394, IrDA, etc. (See Fig. 8 and col. 5, lines 7-10.) Accordingly, the rasterization level appears to be independent of the “image type”, and as such, does not teach “judging... the **image type** of the print data.” Accordingly, independent claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from Isoda.

For reasons similar to those described with regard to claim 1, independent claims 5, 9, 13, 17, 22, and 27-33 are believed to be distinguishable from Isoda.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17-21 and 23-26 depend from one of claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, and 22, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from Isoda for at least the reasons previously described.


Claims 4, 8, 12, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Isoda.

Claims 4, 8, 12, and 16 depend from one of claims 1, 5, 9, and 13, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from Isoda for at least the reasons previously described.

In the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference, there is the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: 
Dennis M. Smid
Reg. No. 34,930
(212) 588-0800